Remarks/Arguments

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Ms. Good-Johnson for the telephone interview held on May 26, 2004 and for the subsequent follow up telephone discussions. Applicants also would like to thank Primary Examiner Mr. Jeffrey Brier for the telephone interview/discussion of June 18, 2004. In those interviews, the discussion focused on the novel features of the Applicants' invention and the term "predetermined displays" and its ordinary meaning vs. its uncommon definition in the specification. Based on the Examiners' recommendations, Applicants have amended the Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12 and 14-19 to replace the term "predetermined displays" with its synonymous term "predetermined abridged forms" and to recite the fact that "predetermined abridged forms" are displayed to represent (i.e. identify) blocks of data that are not displayed (i.e. abridged data or data groups). Both "predetermined displays" and "predetermined abridged forms" are defined in the specification to refer to images, texts, colors, patterns, symbols, or any other type of visual displays that are displayed to represent (i.e. identify) one or more blocks of data that are neither retrieved nor displayed (i.e. abridged data) in the display area. The amended claims now recite that some blocks of data (i.e. data sets) are actually displayed while some other blocks of data (i.e. data groups) are not displayed. The amended claims further recite that predetermined abridged forms are displayed to identify those blocks of data that are not displayed (i.e. abridged data). Applicants believe that the amended claims are now in condition for allowance.

Specification has not been amended. Drawings have not been amended. No new claims have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-19 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Marshal et al., US 6,101,493 (hereinafter "Marshal"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection

for the reasons set forth below:

Marshal teaches a method and system for displaying related information from a database. To

this end, Marshal provides a system and method through which information from related tables of a

database is displayed in different display windows (i.e. different display areas) on a display screen.

The different display windows are interlinked such that a selection of one or more entries in one of

the display windows causes the other of the display windows to distinguishably display those entries

that are related to the selection (see Marshal col. 2, lines 49-55). As an example, Marshal discloses a

database containing related tables such as "Customers", "Products" and "Invoices". Three different

list boxes (i.e. display areas) are provided and each is associated with a different one of the above-

related tables. Each of the list boxes initially displays actual data items (i.e. rows or records of data)

from the associated table. When a record (e.g. "Blanding, Bill") from the list box associated with

the Customer table is selected, it is highlighted. Then, the list boxes associated with Products and

Invoices tables are automatically modified such that they visually (e.g. thru a check-marking or

highlighting) indicate those records that are related to the record selection in the list box associated

with the Customer table. The related records (i.e. first set of retrieved records) are sorted and placed

at the top of the list box before the records that are not related (i.e. second set of retrieved records)

(see Marshal col. 9, lines 34-65). This is different from Applicants' claimed invention, which

provides a method and system for displaying a very large amount of data in a limited display area

(e.g. a list box) so that the contents of all data can be recognized and data transmission load can be

reduced (see Application page 4, lines 12-14). According to the Applicants' invention, some blocks

of data are displayed in full while all other blocks of data are abridged or abbreviated. For example,

the first row and the last row and some intermediate rows of the target data are displayed in full

while for all other rows of the target data that are not actually displayed, a predetermined abridged

form (e.g. "***◇***" or any other symbols used as placeholders) is displayed instead. As a result,

an overall representation of the target data (i.e. an all-inclusive view of target data) is presented in a

limited display area (see Application page 4, line 22 thru page 5, line 2, and Fig. 4). Furthermore,

when a predetermined abridged form representing the abridged data block (i.e. data that is not

currently displayed) is selected within the limited display area, some more rows or blocks of data are

fully displayed and some other rows or blocks of data are again displayed in an abridged form. In

addition, the contents of the abridged data are not read (i.e. retrieved) from the database, only the

fully displayed blocks of data are read from the database. Thus, the communication load for data

access is reduced (see Application page 5, lines 4-20). These distinctions, which are now clearly

recited in each and every one of the amended claims, are apparent in that Applicants' claimed

invention provides for retrieving and displaying a subset of a very large amount of data in a limited

display area and displaying an abridged form representing the data which are not actually retrieved

or displayed. The limited display area in Applicants' invention is not interlinked with any other

display area. Selection of a data item from the display area of the Applicants' invention does not

automatically cause modification of other display areas. Accordingly, the claimed elements are

different from displaying related information from related database tables in multiple associated and

interlinked display areas as disclosed in Marshal. For this reason, Marshal cannot anticipate the

subject matter of Applicants' claimed invention and the § 102(b) rejection of Claims 1-19 couldn't

stand.

11

Claims 1-19

For the claim-by-claim explanation of differences between the Applicants' invention and the Marshal reference, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to the Request for Reconsideration (i.e. Office Action Response) filed 03/11/2004 while keeping the amended claims in mind.

In response to Applicants' arguments filed 03/11/2004, the Examiner states: "the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. predetermined display as identifying one or more predetermined abridged forms of data and that data are displayed in full while other data blocks of data are abridged or abbreviated) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)". As stated above, Applicants have amended the Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12 and 14-19 to replace the term "predetermined displays" with its synonymous term "predetermined abridged forms" and to recite the fact that "predetermined abridged forms" are displayed to represent (i.e. identify) blocks of data that are not displayed (i.e. abridged data or data groups). The amended claims now recite that some blocks of data (i.e. data sets) are actually displayed while some other blocks of data (i.e. data groups) are not displayed. The amended claims further recite that predetermined abridged forms are displayed to identify those blocks of data that are not displayed (i.e. abridged data).

Applicants respectfully point out that there are other features of the claimed invention worth restating. For example, when a predetermined abridged form representing the abridged data block is selected, some more blocks of data out of the target data are fully displayed and some other blocks of data are displayed in an abridged form. Since multiple abridged forms may be displayed, the search time is reduced and desired data is reached more quickly. Further, in this invention, when the data displayed in full is selected, an input operation for the data can be initiated. Thus, even if the

target data is complicated, it can be searched for while referring to the contents of the data, and input

errors can be prevented. In short, a display/input interface that is extremely convenient for a user is

provided. In addition, in the present invention, the contents of the abridged data are not read from

the database, only the fully displayed blocks of data are read from the database. Thus, the

communication load for data access is reduced, and a very convenient GUI can be provided that

imposes only a small communication load, especially in a network environment, such as the Internet.

Applicants believe that the amended claims address the Examiners' concern, recite the novel

features of the invention and are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Final Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is hereby solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Seiji Hamada et al.

By: _____

Farrokh E. Pourmirzaie, Reg. No. 45,297
Agent for Applicants
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
555 Bailey Avenue, J46A/G462
San Jose, CA 95141-9989
Telephone: (408) 463-3539

Date: June 25, 2004